UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,889	04/07/2006	Matteo Zoppas	NBG-113	3357
48388 7590 03/22/2011 LORUSSO & ASSOCIATES EXAMINER				IINER
PO BOX 21915		LUK, EMMANUEL S		
PORTSMOUT	H, NH U38UI		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1744	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,889	ZOPPAS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EMMANUEL S. LUK	1744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON (e, cause the application to become AE)	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this comminates BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/28 2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the cond	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	•	erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration. or election requirement.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to by the E	cepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyar ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apprity documents have been Bu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview 9	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

- 1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 2/28/2011 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 7,879,281 has been reviewed and is NOT accepted.
- 2. The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because: The usage of 35 USC 154 to 156 and 173 is improper. 35 USC 1555-156 makes the terminal disclaimer indefinite, as those statutes do not cover the same rights. View the form at the end of the chapter 1400 or use the form paragraphs in 1490 or view PTO/SB/25 or PTO/SB/26.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 3, and 10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, and 6-11 of copending Application No. 10/541,129. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application teaches the claimed invention of the claimed plate along with slits and the movement of the plate in a horizontal predefined direction that would engage the preforms via teeth, and this to one of ordinary skill in the art would suggest the claimed features of the current claims. In this case the teeth of the copending application would match to the slit with first and second widths having the same engagement for gripping the preforms.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1744

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the copending application and prior art references fails to teach the additional limitations of the plate having a thickness smaller than the distance between the ring and the outer edge of the conditioning cavities, whereby a space is defined, in order to be able to fit into said space when moved in said direction.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments/remarks filed 2/28/2011 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, and 3-9 under have been fully considered. It is noted that a terminal disclaimer has been filed in response to the standing obviousness double patenting rejection. However, the terminal disclaimer is not approved as per reasons stated in the paragraph above. Thus, the obviousness double patenting rejection remains pending until a corrected terminal disclaimer is approved.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1744

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMMANUEL S. LUK whose telephone number is (571)272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yogendra N Gupta/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

EL